

Remarks

Claims 1-7 and 10-17 are pending.

Claims 1-7 and 10-17 are rejected.

The abstract of the disclosure was objected to because the abstract dated 11/16/2000 is silent to events involving emulation. Applicants have amended the Abstract to use the term 'emulator' and its various forms in place of simulator and its various forms. This aligns the language in the Abstract with the language in the specification as previously amended. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claim 1 was objected to since the language, technically, is confusing: "An operating environment emulation system, comprising: a memory to:". The Office believes applicants meant to say "comprising a processor to:". The emulation device, as disclosed in the specification in pages 3-4, may just be a memory and a connector. Applicants have interpreted the confusion as being based in the language 'to store' and have amended the claim to more clearly show that the memory includes multiple emulators and the data file. Applicants believe that this amendment overcomes the objection and requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-7 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traut (US Patent no. 6,651,132) in view of Krammer (US Patent No. 6,826,387) and in further view of Hansen et al. (US Patent No. 5,202,976).

Traut teaches a system in which a computer system operates two different operating systems and manages the transaction look-aside buffer (TLB) such that one operating system will not access the TLB when the TLB contains the memory map for the other operating system. Traut does not teach a memory device *including multiple emulators, wherein each emulator contains instructions to emulate a particular operating environment and a particular operating*

system. Traut appears to assume that the host computer contains one guest, or emulated, operating system, defined at col. 2, lines 10-15. There is no mention of a memory device that contains multiple emulators.

As stated in the office action, Traut fails to teach data files, multiple emulators as well as connectors. The office action relies upon Hansen to teach coordinating measurement activity of a multiple of emulators, and Kammer (referred to as Krammer in the office action, but the patent number is correct) to teach data files and connectors.

Hansen teaches a system in which multiple emulators are plugged into a host computer. The emulation process is specifically defined in Hansen. "An emulator contains a substitute microprocessor and associate electronics that is used in place of the ultimately intended microprocessor." Col. 1, lines 18-20. As stated above, the emulation system of the instant application is a memory and a connector, there is no microprocessor.

Kammer cannot be relied upon in the rejection, as Kammer is unavailable as a reference. Kammer was filed on November 30, 2000, *after* the filing date of this application on November 16, 2000, and therefore also after the priority date of this application, which is August 15, 2000. This application is a continuation of provisional patent application number 60/225,528, filed August 15, 2000. In a telephone conference with the Examiner on January 8, 2007, this was confirmed by the Examiner.

Therefore, for these reasons, the combination of references does not teach the invention as claimed in claims 1-7 and 10. It is submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 11-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traut in view of Krammer, Hansen and Devine et al. (US Patent No. 6,397,242).

Traut was discussed above, as were Krammer and Hansen. Further, with regard to Hansen, the emulators used in Hansen use 'substitute microprocessors.' Claims 11 and 15 have been amended to more clearly show that the emulation is performed by the *host processor*, not a substitute microprocessor.

With regard to claim 11, the office action states that Traut teaches transfer a data file to a memory device, disconnecting the memory device from a first computer and connecting it to a host computer. The references to Traut teach that different operating systems access the same TLB, but there is no other computer in Traut, just the one computer.

Further, the office action relies on Kammer for teaching of the data file and storage of the data file. As stated above, Kammer is an invalid reference for this patent application.

It is therefore submitted that the combination of references does not teach the invention as claimed in claims 11-15 and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claim 15, the office action refers to the requirement of claim 15 of "disabling host task management on the original operating system (settings menu on operating system, e.g. Windows);" but it is not clear as to which reference this language is referring. None of the references teach disabling host task management, whether the host task management be under Windows, etc.

Similarly, the language of claim 15 *activating an environment shutdown by disabling the emulated operating system* is not taught by Traut, col. 6, line 30. That portion of Traut refers to the flushing of the TLB to prevent one operating system from accessing an incorrect memory map. The emulated operating system is not disabled, nor is the emulated environment shut down.

Further, the routing of input/output signals taught by Kammer cannot be relied upon, as the reference is invalid as mentioned above.

Therefore, the combination of references does not teach, show or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 15-17. It is therefore submitted that claims 15-17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

210 S.W. Morrison Street
Suite 400
Portland, Oregon 97204
503-222-3613